

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

Present:

Mr. Justice Muhammad Faisal Kamal Alam
Mr. Justice Amjad Ali Sahito

Criminal Bail Application No.1819 of 2026

Applicant : Raheem @ Shoaib S/o Muhammad
Younis through Mr. Shiraz Ahmed
Bhatti, Advocate

Respondent : The State
through Mr. Abrar Ali, Addl. P.G.
Sindh a/w PI Shakeel Shaikh, PS NKIA

Date of hearing : 09.07.2026

Date of short order : 09.07.2026

ORDER

AMJAD ALI SAHITO, J -- Through this Bail Application, applicant/accused seeks post-arrest bail in Crime No.251/2026 registered under Sections 9(ii)3 CNSA of PS Malir City, Karachi, after his bail plea has been declined by the learned Judge, Special Court/Sessions Court, Malir, Karachi vide order dated 05.05.2026.

2. The detailed facts of the case are already available in the bail application as well as FIR, therefore, the same need not to be reproduced hereunder.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant primarily contended that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It was argued that the alleged recovery of narcotics from the possession of the applicant amounts to only 66 grams, which does not attract the prohibitory clause contained in Section 497, Cr.P.C. Learned counsel further submitted that the applicant has been shown arrest in the instant FIR when he was arrested in another Crime No.249/2026; as such, the same is foisted upon him. He

further contended that the prosecution neither associated any private person as a mashir nor produced any video recording of the alleged recovery, which, according to him, constitutes a clear violation of Section 103, Cr.P.C., as well as Section 17(2) of the Sindh Control of Narcotic Substances Act, 2024. He further contended that the applicant has remained behind bars for more than three months and is no longer required for any further investigation. On these premises, he prayed for the grant of post-arrest bail to the applicant.

4. Conversely, the learned Additional Prosecutor General, Sindh, vehemently opposed the grant of bail and contended that though the applicant was arrested in another crime but at that time, ice was also recovered from his possession; therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have carefully examined the material available on the record.

6. A perusal of the record reveals that the applicant was initially arrested in Crime No.249/2026 and was subsequently shown to have been arrested in the instant FIR as well. It is alleged that only 66 grams of ICE was recovered from the front pocket of the applicant's pant. However, the contents of the FIR are silent with regard to the material particulars of the alleged recovery and do not furnish any further details connecting the applicant with the commission of the alleged offence.

7. Insofar as the contention of the learned counsel for the applicant regarding the prosecution's failure to produce any video recording of the alleged recovery of narcotics is concerned, the same prima facie carries substance and warrants due consideration. Section 17 of the Sindh Control of Narcotic Substances Act, 2024 has been enacted with the avowed object of ensuring transparency, fairness and accountability in the conduct of raids, searches, seizures and

arrests carried out under the Act. For facility of reference, Section 17(2) of the said Act is reproduced hereinbelow:

“Video recording of all raids, seizures, inspections and arrests shall be made by the officer in charge of such operation.”

8. A perusal of the record reflects that 66 grams of ICE was allegedly recovered from the possession of the applicant/accused, who has remained in judicial custody for the more than three months; however, no meaningful progress has been made in the trial proceedings. The question regarding the quantum of sentence, if any, shall be determined at the conclusion of the trial, subject to the prosecution successfully establishing its case against the applicant/accused. The alleged offence carries a maximum punishment of one year imprisonment and a minimum sentence of six months, and, therefore, does not fall within the prohibitory clause of Section 497, Cr.P.C. It is a settled principle of law that grant of bail is the rule and its refusal is an exception. The learned Additional Prosecutor General has failed to point out any exceptional circumstance warranting the denial of bail to the applicant/accused.

9. Furthermore, all the prosecution witnesses are police officials and, therefore, there appears to be no likelihood of the applicant tampering with the prosecution evidence. The prosecution has also failed to place on record any material to indicate that the applicant/accused is a previous convict or is involved in any other case of a similar nature. At the bail stage, the Court is required to make only a tentative assessment of the material available on record, and a deeper appreciation of the evidence is not permissible.

10. In the aforesaid circumstances, the case of the applicant/accused falls within the ambit of further

inquiry as contemplated under subsection (2) of Section 497, Cr.P.C. Consequently, the learned counsel for the applicant has succeeded in making out a case for the grant of post-arrest bail. Resultantly, the instant bail application was allowed, and the applicant/accused was admitted to bail, subject to furnishing solvent surety in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) and a personal recognizance bond in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

11. Needless to mention here that the observations made hereinabove are tentative in nature and would not influence the learned Trial Court while deciding the case of the applicant on merits.

12. These are the reasons of our short Order dated 09.07.2026.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Kamran/PS